



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The conclusions drawn by the author may be shown by the following citations: "The inheritance tax seems to be preëminently an institution of democracy." "That the inheritance tax is very commonly regarded as something more than a purely fiscal measure is shown by frequent proposals to use the proceeds for certain benevolent or educational purposes." "The inheritance tax seems admirably adapted to replace the antiquated personal property tax in state budgets." "As long as the state inheritance taxes are no heavier than at present, a federal tax might perhaps be superimposed upon them, as was done temporarily during the Spanish War, without making the burden excessive." But the author does not favor this possibility, holding that the tax should be retained and developed by the states.

CARL C. PLEHN.

University of California.

Apprenticeship in American Trade Unions. By JAMES M. MOTLEY, Assistant Professor of Economics in Leland Stanford, Jr., University. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1907. Pp. 110. 50c.).

This is an admirable, scholarly piece of research, of the highest credit to its author and the economic seminary of Johns Hopkins University. There is but one place where I would raise a question, and that is in the difficult attempt to classify the unions according to the extent to which they enforce apprenticeship as a prerequisite to membership. About fifty unions do not attempt to maintain apprenticeship systems. These include thirty-five unions of unskilled workmen, such as garment workers and hod-carriers, eleven highly skilled trades like the railroad brotherhoods, where the employer must assure himself that the men are competent, seven trades with a minute division of labor, like the carriage and wagon workers, and a few professions rather than trades, like the musicians. At the other extreme, nineteen unions actually succeed in enforcing apprenticeship conditions, such as lace operatives and iron moulders, where highly trained workmen are required, where the industry is highly localized and the union is well organized. The other fifty unions, like the building trades, are only partially successful, where the national organization leaves the enforcement

to the local unions. In these the estimate is made that "less than one-half of those working as journeymen have served the prescribed apprenticeship term in union shops." This classification could be improved by noticing that some unions are composed of different branches and that apprenticeship is enforced in one or more branches, but not in others. A classification according to branches, for example, would place the stove molders in the group of nineteen and the machinery molders in the group of fifty. So for the clothing cutters, who are a branch of the garment workers, and so on. Of course, in an attempted classification of this kind, all of the unions cannot be rigidly assigned to a single class. The main thing is to analyze the conditions and to mark off the classes with typical cases. This enumeration is a minor but extremely interesting part of the author's work.

The main emphasis is placed on the historical development of apprenticeship and upon the critical analysis of union regulations. The historical development is well worked out, through the period of legal indentures, customary rules, the break-up of the old system and the incoming of trade union regulations under the organization of national and international unions. The interesting distinction is brought out that the unions tried to retain the customary rules in the matter of the long term of apprenticeship, but to abandon these rules in the matter of unlimited number of apprentices. The chapters on the purpose and character of apprenticeship regulations are valuable contributions to the subject, treated under the headings of uniformity, standards of workmanship, strategic advantage in collective bargaining, conditions of entrance, age, term of service, number of apprentices, wages and training. The monograph closes with a typical or model apprenticeship agreement between employers' associations and unions.

JOHN R. COMMONS.

University of Wisconsin.

Die Anfänge der Deutschen Arbeiterbewegung in Amerika. Von HERMANN SCHLÜTER. (Stuttgart: J. H. W. Dietz, 1907. Pp. 214. 4 m.).

This book is a most valuable contribution to the history of the American labor movement. The author, as editor of the New